

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALFRED LAM, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.
THE CITY & COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 10-cv-4641-PJH

**ORDER SETTING BRIEFING
SCHEDULE FOR MOTION TO REVIEW
TAXATION OF COSTS**

On March 14, 2016, defendant timely filed a bill of costs, seeking \$22,334.76. On March 28, 2016, plaintiffs timely filed objections, and on April 14, 2016, the clerk taxed costs in the amount of \$20,294.05.

On April 21, 2016, plaintiffs filed a “notice of motion and motion objections to defendants’ bill of cost.” See Dkt. 217. Although styled as “objections,” the court construes plaintiffs’ filing as a motion seeking review of the clerk’s taxation of costs under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1). Accordingly, the court will allow defendant to file an opposition and plaintiff to file a reply. Defendant’s opposition shall be filed no later than **April 29, 2016**, and plaintiff’s reply shall be filed no later than **May 9, 2016**. Both filings shall be limited to ten (10) pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 22, 2016



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge